1: Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SH5 Tehuelche SH5
Patagonia SH I

Pa 175 113

Cardiel, Quiroga, Strobel, Camaño, Rejón, García, Querini, and particularly Falkner and Sánchez Labrador, we get for the first time an insight into the cultural and linguistic lay of the Pampean area and into its relations with the Patagonian and *Araucanian*. (Most of cultural data are given in Sánchez Labrador, 1936; Falkner, 1774; Pennant, 1788; and Fürlong Cárdiff, 1936 a).

Pa 113

Some very valuable anthropological information also was contributed by the 19th-century Protestant missionaries: Coan, 1833–34; Gardiner, 1842, 1845; Schmid and Hunziker, 1859–62. (For details, cf.: Gardiner, 1852; Marsh and Stirling, 1874; Coan, 1880; Outes, 1926 b, 1928 c.)

Pa 175

The period came to an end with the military campaigns under Generals Julia Roca and Conrado Villegas in 1879–83, which completely defeated and disorganized the Indian confederates, cleared the Pampa region almost entirely of its Indian inhabitants, and drove most of the survivors beyond the Río Negro and into Neuquén.

Recent period, 1883 to date.—Settlers, following the frontier, have taken up most of the country from the northern limit of the Pampa to the Strait of Magellan. The surviving Indians are found scattered here and there in small groups, mostly south of the Río Negro. The process of Europeanization has been in full swing; the native culture has largely been replaced. Relatively very little field work has been done among the survivors during the last 60 years. The Salesian missionaries, Fathers Milanesio (1896, 1917) and Borgatello (1924), have given us some new light direct from the toldos of the natives. A great deal of attention has been devoted by a corps of Argentine scholars—Canals Frau, Fürlong C., Lehmann-Nitsche, Outes, Serrano, Vignati, and others—and by Fonck and Latcham of Chile, to critical surveys and interpretations of published and manuscript data, a work still in active progress.

Selected annotated lists of the more important of our very numerous first-hand sources on the culture of the *Tehuelche*, *Poya*, and *Puelche* will be given infra under Culture at the beginning of the sections on the culture of the respective three tribes.

There are few more urgent tasks facing anthropological science than thorough studies, as thorough as possible under the circumstances of native cultural disintegration, of the surviving *Tehuelche* and *Puelche*, studies made directly in the field, from information that may probably still be gotten from older members of the fast-dwindling remnants of these once numerous and powerful tribes.

CULTURE

T 128

Our cultural data are fullest and most clearly identified for the *Tehuelche*, whose culture will be treated first. Next will follow a

1: Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SH5 Tehuelche SH5
Puelche SI 10

short account of the *Poya*. Finally, we shall deal with the culture of the *Puelche*. T [128]

In the case of the *Puelche*, were we to confine ourselves to those data which are unmistakably and beyond all possibility of doubt attributable to people speaking the *Puelche* language, we should have to rely almost exclusively on D'Orbigny's extremely brief account. For reasons previously given, we seem to be on fairly safe ground in concluding that the *Puelche* of D'Orbigny's day were the linguistic descendants of Sánchez Labrador's "*Puelche*" ("*Pampa*," "*Serrano*") six or seven decades earlier. If not the linguistic descendants, they were almost certainly the cultural ones. We shall use, therefore, the data from Sánchez Labrador, where we can be sure he is speaking of cultural phenomena peculiar to his and our *Puelche* or shared by them with the contemporary *Tehuelche* and/or Argentine *Araucanians*. P 127

For those who hold with Lehmann-Nitsche to the former existence of a *Het* family on the Pampa, what we shall describe as *Puelche* culture would connote, so far as the description rests on data from Sánchez Labrador, *Het* culture or *Het-Puelche* culture.

Less use can be made of Falkner than of Sánchez Labrador, as the former gives fewer details and discriminates less between *Araucanian*, *Tehuelche*, and *Puelche* cultural features.

TEHUELCHE CULTURE

On *Tehuelche* culture the very early sources prior to 1670 yield only the most meager information, and this almost exclusively regarding the more obvious elements of material culture. About the best of these early sources, such as they are, are Pigafetta (1906) and Fletcher (1854). T 113

The most important later sources are Viedma (1837 b) and Musters (1871, 1872).

Next in importance to these last three publications may be listed: Borgatello (1924), Bourne (1853), Coan (1880), Moreno (1879), Muñiz (1917), and D'Orbigny (1835–47). Some good material is also found scattered through the works of: Cox (1863), Falkner (1774), Fitz-Roy (1839, dependent largely on Falkner), Gardiner (1839), Lista (1879 a, 1879 b), Pennant (1788, data derived from Falkner in England), Reiher (1930), Roncagli (1864), Sánchez Labrador (1936), and Spegazzini (1884). On the linguistic relations of the *Tehuelche*, Lehmann-Nitsche (1913) is basic, while Cardiel (1938) and Camaño (1937) were important pioneer contributors.

Where it is possible or advisable to distinguish between the culture of the foot *Tehuelche* before 1670 and that of the horse-using *Tehuelche* after 1741, in the following account of *Tehuelche* culture the terms "early" and "later" will be used respectively. T 128